

United States Patent and Trademark Office

lon

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,481	04/12/2006	Toshirou Umeki	1110/97146	1373
24628 WEISH & KA	7590 01/07/2008		EXAMINER	
WELSH & KATZ, LTD 120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA			HITESHEW, FELISA CARLA	
22ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1792	-
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/575,481	UMEKI, TOSHIROU			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Felisa C. Hiteshew	1792			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.) period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w ree to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timulated will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status			•			
2a)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5) □ 6) ⊠ 7) □ 8) □ Applicati 9) □ 10) □	Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the oregin of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner The oath or declaration is obje	election requirement. r. epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119		·			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔯 Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date 04/12/2006+	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te			

10/575,481 Art Unit: 1792

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

The PTOL 1449 has been received, reviewed and considered.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 4 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim can not be dependent upon other dependent claims. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 5. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Abstract JP-08119790 A by Umeki (JP'790 A).

10/575,481 Art Unit: 1792

The Japanese patent abstract '790 A teaches a Czocharlski apparatus, comprising a pulling shaft which is divided to an upper and a lower shaft connected to each other by a wire there between, and a means to lift and lower the shaft, and a weight sensor. The lower shaft is installed on the upper end of a force bar (e.g. made from a carbon material) connected to each other by a wire. A number of ceramic steel balls or a guide collar made from a carbon material may be placed between a guide shaft, which surrounds the upper and the lower crystal, the wire, and the force bar.

The difference being that the Japanese patent abstract '790 A does not teach a plurality of collars. However, in the absence of unobvious results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine through routine experimentation the optimum, operable apparatus limitations in order to ensure proper orientation. Note, that "Duplication of parts was held to have been obvious". In re Harza 124 USPQ 378. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Felisa Hiteshew whose telephone number is (571) 272-1463. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Thursday from 5:30 AM to 4:00 PM with Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr, can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-1463.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

10/575,481 Art Unit: 1792

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system. see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866- 217-9197 (toll-free).

FELISA HITESHEW
PRIMARY EXAMINER